ERIC Document Resume	See Instruction Sheet	DATE OF RESUME	DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER	2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).	3. IDENTIFICATION NO.
ED002059	N.A.	N.A.

DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

4. AUTHOR(S): Advisory Committee on Human Relations

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED: The Allen Report on New York City Schools

6. PUBLICATION TITLE: Integrated Education

7. EDITOR(S): Weinberg, Meyer

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN: ORG. Integrated Education Associates, 343 S. ST. Dearborn Street, CITY, STATE Chicago, Ill.

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE: Integrated Education Associates, 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
II	14-33	Sept. 1964	20

TELE. EXT. INST/LOC CODE

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE: YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED: YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED: YES ☒ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT: PROPOSAL ☐ IN-PROGRESS ☐ FINAL ☒ FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR: Report

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

teacher training	school organization	faculty		
open enrollment	school construction	integration		
special zoning	preprimary			
	equal opportunities			

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

An evaluation of past and present programs for ethnic desegregation, accomplished through public schools, and proposals for further steps to that end are presented.

In 1954, steps were taken to analyze the racial mixture of the schools. By 1958 a committee recommended zoning, site selection and construction, and pupil redistribution to improve racial balance. Only the first two were implemented in some way. In 1963 an open enrollment program allowed children from crowded segregated schools to travel by bus to less crowded mixed schools; however, open enrollment has had no significant effect on the extent of de facto segregation. The school board made about 100 changes in zoning but permitted more than 600 exceptions for high school attendance. Despite these efforts, segregation, city wide, has not been reduced. Planned efforts include a free choice transfer policy, greater integration of junior high schools, and the pairing of elementary schools for racial mixture.

It was recommended that large high schools be planned for the white neighborhoods soon to be integrated. These schools would use open enrollment programs and would absorb ninth-grade students from junior high schools. To extend the process to lower grades, new middle schools for grades 5-8, fed by elementary schools of different races, would replace junior high schools. Primary schools including prekindergarten through grade four would be organized on a small neighborhood basis and use a nongraded organization. Where possible, educational complexes of primary and middle schools would be formed. Equal opportunities for staff advancement and recruitment are essential, and teachers should be trained especially for urban schools.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION	20. DIVISION OR DEPT.	21. CONTRACT NO. / PROJECT NO.
	22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT	
	23. DURATION OF PROJECT	U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education

ERIC Form 1

ED002059

Aug - Sep. 64

THE ALLEN REPORT ON NEW YORK CITY SCHOOLS

Advisory Committee on
Human Relations

Complete text of report by the State Education Commission's Advisory Committee on Human Relations and Community Tensions, Desegregating the Public Schools of New York City, May 12, 1964. The State Commissioner of Education is Dr. James E. Allen, Jr. Members of his Advisory Committee are Judah Cahn, Rabbi, Metropolitan Synagogue, Kenneth B. Clark, Professor of Psychology at the College of the City of New York, and John H. Fischer, chairman, President, Teachers College, Columbia University. The report was prepared with the assistance of the Institute of Urban Studies, Teachers College, Columbia University. Omitted are an introduction and statistical appendices.

Efforts to improve teaching and other school services are a necessary part of any sound effort to desegregate the schools. Desegregation without improved instruction could produce equal but poor education for all. On the other hand, improved instruction without real desegregation could not contradict the fact that when schooling has been separate, even if only *de facto*, it has almost invariably meant *de facto*, unequal education.

Superintendent Calvin Gross stated in December, 1963:

> The entire school integration program may be summarized under two headings; the achievement of equality of education and vocational opportunity for all children, and particularly those of minority group status; and the promotion of ethnic integration. These two complementary approaches have formed the warp and woof of efforts to improve the education of Negro and Puerto Rican children in New York City—efforts which have absorbed a major share of energy of the school system for more than nine years.

Throughout its work our committee has been concerned with both objectives, but this report deals chiefly with the promoting of ethnic integration. We prefer, however, to speak of desegregation rather than integration or ethnic balance, since the segregated school is the evidence of the difficulty and must therefore be the target of the corrective effort.

The earliest possible elimination of *de facto* school segregation should be the overriding concern of all responsible groups and authorities.

The aim of this report is to evaluate past programs and current plans for ethnic desegregation of the New York City public schools and to propose further steps to that end. If these steps are to succeed they must be accompanied by immediate, far reaching, and intensive new efforts to raise the quality of instruction in all the schools, beginning with those now most urgently in need of improvement.

We are aware of and appreciate the various actions of the board of education to improve instruction in public schools in depressed areas, to recruit more teachers from minority groups, to consider Negro and Puerto Rican personnel for advancement to administrative positions, and to introduce remedial, guidance, and other special services into the system as counterforces to the effects of increasing segregation over the last several years. Many of these efforts are commendable. Some are like several of our recommendations in intent, if not in substance or scope.

We believe that such improvements are essential *but must be combined with effective steps toward desegre-*

REPRINTED BY PERMISSION
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN PRINTED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Aug - Sep. 64

gation. This report confines its evaluation for the most part to desegregation policies; and, while we have reviewed past efforts of the board to desegregate, we are also concerned with educational programs that advance beyond where the system is at this time. We have assumed that the board's present efforts at improving instruction and personnel will continue.

DEFINING PUBLIC SCHOOL SEGREGATION*

In developing this evaluation, we sought an unequivocal definition of the ethnically segregated public school. After considering alternatives, we chose to define a public school in *New York City* as ethnically segregated if, in 1963, it enrolled less than 10% Negroes and/or Puerto Rican or if it enrolled less than 10% from other groups. For clarity we refer to others as White, despite the imprecision. (The terms, Puerto Rican and White are most doubtful, since most Puerto Ricans were classified as Whites in the 1960 Census. Our use of "Whites" ignores the fact that the word "Other" included Oriental-Americans, Indian-Americans, etc. Nevertheless, we employ the 3 terms, Negro, Puerto Rican, and White on the ground that they are fairly accurate and commonly understood.) Three types of schools result from this definition:

1) *White Type.* A *white* type school is one enrolling more than 90% Others, here termed Whites, and fewer than 10% Negroes or Puerto Rican pupils. This, under our definition is a *segregated* school.

2) *Desegregated Type.* A *desegregated* school is one enrolling fewer than 90% Negro and Puerto Rican pupils, and 10% or more Whites. By our definition, this school is desegregated since at least 10% of its students are Negroes and Puerto Ricans and another 10%, at least, are Whites.

> I transmit this report with the expectation that it will stimulate immediate, direct, decisive action by the board and the superintendent.
> —James E. Allen, Jr.

3, *Negro-Puerto Rican Type.* A school enrolling more than 90% Negro and Puerto Rican pupils, is defined as a *segregated* school of the Negro-Puerto Rican type, because less than 10% of the student body is White.

Our definition is exact, if arbitrary, and seems to us reasonable in the light of the present facts in New York City. A criterion of larger magnitude in a city in which more than *half* the first and second graders are Negro or Puerto Rican would be unrealistic. Moreover, if a larger interval were accepted, it would not greatly affect the critical category of Negro-Puerto Rican Type segregated schools: Under the criterion of 10% we used, 22% of the elementary schools in the city were minority segregated in 1963. Under a 20% criterion, this increases to 29%; and under a 30% criterion, this increases to 31%. Thus our 10% standard contains 131 elementary schools, while the apparently much wider 30% criterion would include 183. Our standard includes nearly 3/4 of this 183. The 10% standard, incidentally, was the one used in the Public Education Association's 1954 study of the New York Schools, and it was employed most recently in a distinguished analysis of segregation in the Chicago public schools.

EARLY DESEGREGATION EFFORTS

The New York City board of education in 1954 appointed a committee to examine the racial composition of the public schools and to recommend actions to achieve racial integration. This Committee recommended in 1958 that three mechanisms be employed:

**Note: Our data in this report refer to regular, day-type elementary and secondary schools. "600" and other special schools are excluded. This, and the periodic regrouping of schools, explain differences in our figures that appear in one or two places in this report.*

aug - Sep. 64

zoning, site selection and construction, and pupil redistribution. An Advisory Council on Zoning was subsequently formed, but there is no evidence that it effected any lasting results, although several new schools were built and some older ones modernized in ethnically mixed as opposed to segregated neighborhoods. The Commission's recommendations on the redistribution of pupils through "permissive zoning" and busing were not implemented.

OPEN ENROLLMENT IN NEW YORK CITY

On the basis of experience during 1959 with the transporting of children from schools in the heavily segregated Bedford-Stuyvesant section of Brooklyn to mixed schools in Queens, the board of education introduced a plan for Open Enrollment.

The board introduced a larger Open Enrollment program which permitted students with the consent of their parents to transfer out of segregated schools by the Fall of 1963. A total of roughly 16,000 students were affected or less than 1% of all students in the public system as a whole, or about 3% of the Negro and Puerto Rican student population.

Open Enrollment has had no significant effect on the extent of segregation. It *cannot* have, as it depends wholly upon voluntary choice among Negro and Puerto Rican parents. In September, 1963, for example, when the program was revised and enlarged, about 110,000 elementary pupils were offered the opportunity to transfer. Of this number, about 2,000 applied, and some 1,800 were in fact transferred—an impact of less than 2% of those given the option.

ZONING

The board made about 100 changes in district and school zones in order to stimulate desegregation between 1959 and 1963. In addition, the board permitted more than 600 individual exceptions, called zoning variances, for high school attendance in the same period. These changes, together with those summarized above, constitute *all* notable efforts by the board and its staff as of 1963 to reduce the level of *de facto* segregation among students in the city's public schools.

> The report recognizes integration as a part of the larger issue of improving the schools and sees in the need for dealing with integration the opportunity and challenge for raising the quality of the entire school system — with the aim that equality of opportunity shall everywhere mean excellence of opportunity.
>
> —James E. Allen, Jr.

EVALUATING EFFECTS OF PAST EFFORTS

Data have been gathered on the ethnic composition of the schools only since 1958. If past efforts of the board have affected the level of segregation, the effect should be measurable—however slight—by comparing the 1958 data with those from 1963. [Any change in school segregation noted in our figures must be qualified. First, the underlying data are to some degree inaccurate, since they are based on visual judgements of classroom teachers as to each child's ethnicity. Secondly, about 5% of *any* increase in segregation is attributable to ethnic changes in school and city populations. Thus, if schools changed in percent segregated from 10% (1958 to 20% (1963), we would estimate that half of this change was inevitable. Had they declined from 20% to 10%, we would conclude that Board efforts might have had up to a 5% effect.]

The fraction of Negro-Puerto Rican Type segregated schools in New York City increased over the 5 years from 12% to 22% at the elementary level, from 10% to 19% at the junior high level, and from 0% to 2% at the senior high school level.

About 3/4 of the city's schools did not change in percent Negro or Puerto Rican during the same period. Among the 1/4 that did change, however, nearly all increased very

Aug-Sep. 64

substantially in percent Negro or Puerto Rican. *Despite Open Enrollment, rezoning, and associated efforts, segregation, city wide, has not been reduced. On the contrary, the overall level of segregation has increased.*

No act of the board of education from 1958 through 1962, with a single small exception, has had a measurable effect on the degree of school segregation. This exception may be at the senior high school level. Although there are White Type segregated high schools, as of 1963 only one high school was clearly identifiable as a Negro-Puerto Rican Type segregated school. This is the Girls' High School in Brooklyn, which, under the board's recent plan, will be abandoned. Benjamin Franklin High School, which was 11% White in 1963, has also received board attention in an effort to improve its situation.

About 78 public schools below the high school level became segregated between 1958 and 1963. (The number will vary slightly depending upon the classification of certain schools that were combined during the period.) A judgment as to whether board efforts *slowed* the rate of school segregation in this period would require more detailed data from the years 1953 through 1963, but *our impression is that not a single elementary or junior high school that was changing toward segregation after 1958 by virtue of residential changes and the transfer of Whites into parochial and private schools was prevented from becoming segregated by board action.* There were schools whose composition was changed toward desegregation during this period, but they appear to be located in neighborhoods where urban renewal, relocation and redevelopment involved the displacement of families. Of the board's desegregation activities [during this period] only the Open Enrollment program was large in scale. It affected only previously segregated schools—and even there, too few pupils to modify the trends.

EVALUATION OF 1964-1970 SCHOOL BUILDING PROGRAM

The board has adopted a program for erecting new buildings and renovating old ones during the next 6 years and beyond. Of the 44 projected for action in 1964 and 1965, about 20 are located at points *outside* existing, overcrowded residential ghettoes. A statement in explanation of the site selections prepared by the board's planning and Research Division helps interpret this fact:

> A more helpful perspective would be achieved if we viewed the budget from the vantage point of providing desperately needed additional accommodations to achieve a full day in badly overcrowded areas of the city. From this viewpoint, the board of education is recognizing these needs and taking steps to satisfy them.

The school building program as presently set forth reinforces substantially the historic pattern of building on sites within the most segregated areas. This is the case chiefly in Negro residential areas, but it is also true in some mainly White neighborhoods, and thus helps to intensify both forms of segregation.

To date, desegregation has not been a main factor in the programming of construction and physical renovation. Building plans have developed in response to population increase, age and quality of existing plant, transport conditions, and site availability. If the purpose to desegregate was considered at all, it apparently was ranked in importance below these other considerations.

> If the New York City schools are to be as good as they must become, the average expenditure per pupil may have to be raised a third or more over present levels. . . . At issue here is far more than how to build a few schools or raise teachers' salaries another notch. The whole question of New York City's future as a place to live is now being answered.
>
> —The Advisory Committee

Aug - Sp. 64

EVALUATION OF THE FREE CHOICE TRANSFER POLICY

The board announced late in 1963, a Free Choice Transfer Policy. This permits any child in a school with a "high" percentage of Negro or Puerto Ricans to transfer, at his parent's request, to any other school where space is available.

This Policy improves upon the Open Enrollment Plan. The board intends, for instance, to define space available "liberally," that is, at something more than 100% of rated capacity. In addition, the standard for a "high percentage" of minority students will be lowered "progressively" over the years. And, unlike the Open Enrollment Plan, once a school qualifies under the new policy, any student in it may apply for a transfer.

In our judgment, the Free Choice Transfer Policy, whatever its other merits, and we think it has some, will probably have no city-wide effect on the level of segregation. It is an optional, not a required program. It puts the burden for desegregation entirely on the voluntary and individual decisions of Negro and Puerto Rican parents. A handful of Whites may elect to use the programs, but generally the policy will tend to operate in but one direction: minority children will transfer out of Negro-Puerto Rican Type segregated schools. The total enrollment of such schools may decline a bit, but they will not gain White students and therefore will not be desegregated as a result of the policy.

EVALUATION OF THE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL FEEDER PATTERN CHANGES

The board of education plans to change the pattern of elementary schools feeding into junior high schools. Specifically, the board proposed 10 such changes and then reduced this number to 6, out of a total of 132 regular junior high schools.

The number of Negro-Puerto Rican Type junior high schools in the city increased from 12 in 1958, to 25 in 1963; or from 10% to 19% of all junior highs. At the same time the White Type junior high schools declined from 43% to 22%. In numbers of students, about 45% of the city's Negro and Puerto Rican youths attended segregated junior high schools in 1963.

The 6 Feeder Pattern Changes proposed by the board would *reduce* the percent of segregated junior high schools from the present 41% to 39%. At this rate of desegregation, and ignoring natural population changes in the interval, the junior high school system would be desegregated by about the year 2010.

If a great effort were made to desegregate the 25 junior high schools which are now Negro-Puerto Rican Type schools, the new policy could make a difference within a single decade. Such an effort is not proposed by the board of education.

EVALUATION OF PAIRING PROPOSALS

The chief innovation made by the board in 1964 was the location of 21 areas where elementary schools might be paired. Under this policy, two schools in proximity would be so organized that each building would be used for selected grades for all pupils in the combined zones of the two schools.

In 1958, 12% of all elementary schools were Negro-Puerto Rican segregated, compared with 22% in 1963. If all 21 of the pairings proposed by the board were to be introduced at once in 1964-65, this fraction of 22% would drop to 21%. *The pairing proposal thus would reduce minority school segregation in the city by 1% if introduced all at once.* Not only have many of the proposed sites been withdrawn following local opposition, however, but the board proposed to make only 4 such pairings in September, 1964.

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION OF BOARD PROPOSALS AND EFFORTS

We must conclude that nothing undertaken by the New York City board of education since 1954, and nothing proposed since 1963, has contributed

Aug - Sept. 67

> Two reasons compel us to do our best to achieve well-integrated schools. One is the moral imperative to assure all children true equality of opportunity. The other is the educational necessity to prepare every child to take his place in a world where no race may any longer live alone. The desegregation of the public schools of New York City, therefore, means more than a better education for minority children. It means also a significant addition to the educative power of the schools for all children.
>
> —The Advisory Committee

or will contribute in any meaningful degree to desegregating the public schools of the city. Each past effort, each current plan, and each projected proposal is either not aimed at reducing segregation or is developed in too limited a fashion to stimulate even slight progress toward desegregation.

Our data suggest that present conditions and immediate possibilities are relatively most favorable at the senior high school level. Here, the system is 2/3 desegregated. However, nearly 1/3 of the high schools continue to be of the White Type. Many of these are the most advantaged schools in the system, and board policies have not addressed the task of desegregating these "choice" institutions.

At the elementary school level, the board has done nothing and proposed no plan that would reduce current levels, or stem the rising tide of segregation.

With no special policies, Negro-Puerto Rican Type segregated elementary schools will tend to grow from 22% of all the schools in 1963 to 31% in 1970, to perhaps 38% in 1975. We estimate that the pairing of some 20 elementary schools a year—presuming a very active extension of the Board plan—would yield a system that would still be 24% minority segregated in 1970.

The feeder changes proposed for junior high schools would have merit, if the proposed annual rate of change were increased by about 3 times, and if chief attention were given to mincrity rather than to White Type segregated schools.

SOME UNDERLYING FORCES

Before advancing alternative suggestions, we wish to describe the population changes which have historically characterized the social situation in New York City, and are likely to do so in the fututre. Any planning on so vital an educational issue as desegregation should be done, we believe, on the basis of full knowledge of the total community situation.

Public school ethnic segregation is less severe in New York City than in most major central cities such as Philadelphia, Chicago, and Detroit. In Chicago, for example, 37% of all elementary schools were Negro Type segregated in 1963, compared with 22% in New York City; and 18% of the high schools were Negro segregated, compared with 2% in New York City.

The ethnic minorities are numericolly larger in New York City; and residential segregation is different in pattern. Chicago's population was 23% non-white in 1960, where New York City's was 22% Negro and Puerto Rican. However, the numerically smaller Chicago minority was crowded for the most part into one elongated "Black Belt." New York City's ghettoes are more dispersed; indeed, there are 7 large, circle-shaped ghettoes in noncontiguous areas. In any case, *de facto* school segregation is not unique to New York City. It is rather a major social problem in most large and many smaller northern metropolitan communities.

De facto segregation in public schools cannot be attributed to intentional policies of the board of education in New York City. Given the prevalence of the neighborhood school principle under which urban public schools are organized, and which continues to be preferred by most parents, school segregation is a by-product of pat-

Aug - Sep. 64

terns of segregation in settlement and housing.

Two great migrations form the basis for public school segregation in New York City today. The greater of the two is the movement of Negroes from the South. In 1910, 89% of the nation's Negro population resided in the South. In the same year, only about 100,000 or 1% of the total resided in the New York metropolitan area. By 1960, nearly 1.3 million Negroes, o. about 6% of the nation's Negro population, had settled here. In the 50 years from 1910 to 1960, while the number of Negroes in the United States approximately doubled, the number of Negroes in the New York urban area multiplied *ten times.*

The second great migration has been the movement into the city and its area of Puerto Ricans. The Puerto Rican population grew from less than 1% to nearly 6% of the urban area population between 1940 and 1960. Both migrations will continue, though at a decreasing rate, for the rest of this century.

As the Negro and Puerto Rican population in New York City have increased, other groups have spread outward to the perimeters of the city and into its suburbs. This change also continues. *About 1/5 of the city population was Negro and Puerto Rican in 1960. About 1/4 will be in 1965; the fraction may expand to 1/3 by 1970.*

The 20% Negro and Puerto Rican residents of the city in 1960 were crowded into extremely overpopulated, segregated sections of the city. The Puerto Ricans have dispersed gradually since 1955, but Negroes continue to be confined chiefly to 7 residential ghettoes. New little islands have started elsewhere, but real dispersion is rare.

For the public schools, this situation is intensified by more than the departure of whites, or more advantaged groups, from the city. Residential segregation and a rapid thinning of whites is further confounded by the fact that New York City parents have the option of choice among public, private and parochial schools. Because the latter are overwhelmingly white in composition, and because the number of these schools has grown substantially since 1950, the overall fraction of Negroes and Puerto Ricans in the public schools far exceeds their representation in the city population at large. The percentage of minority children is also larger in the lower grades than at the upper levels. In the Bronx, for example, in 1960 when 25% of all residents were Negro or Puerto Rican, 43% of the students in the public schools were of those groups. In the elementary schools, 51% were from the two minorities. This difference is attributable not so much to size of family or birth rate (as is often believed), but rather to the fact that the more recently arrived households of Negroes and Puerto Ricans are younger than their white neighbors, and therefore have younger children.

Three present population trends are likely to continue to affect New York City no matter what policies are adopted for the public schools. First, the proportion of public school pupils who are Negro and Puerto Rican will continue to increase. *We estimate that minority pupils will exceed 50% in 1965, 66% in 1970, and 70% in 1975.* Secondly, these increases will be differentially distributed. The Manhattan schools already have 73% Negro and Puerto Rican pupils. The Queens schools will not reach the 40% to 50% interval until about 1980. Third, within each borough, unless unforeseen changes occur, this increase will continue to take place under patterns of residential segregation. As White Type segregated schools remain persistently underutilized in many places, Negro-Puerto Rican Type segregated schools will continue to become overcrowded.

All three trends add to the difficulty of forming a policy for effective desegregation. The continuing overall decrease in the white component of the school population further reduces the possibility of easy improvement. Moreover, the wide differences in the various sections of the city require different policies in different sections. Most painfully, overcrowding in the

Aug - Sep. 64

residential ghettoes makes many efforts to desegregate futile, for distance and population concentration work against nearly all forms of redistribution. Many features of this population process are beyond the control of either the board of education or any other agency of city government.

White New Yorkers do not move out of the city simply because of prejudice. White migration to the suburbs results from many economic, social and familial forces. The migration *out of the region, largely White,* is a response to the rapid rates of growth in the West and Southwest areas of the nation.

An increase in the ratio of Negroes and Puerto Ricans to whites in city public schools helps to *precipitate* movement out of the public schools and out of the city. When ethnic imbalance occurs, all three broad ethnic groups lose, educationally and socially. As the rate of immigration rises or imbalance reaches a certain level in relation to the distribution of residents in the neighborhood around a public school, non-Puerto Rican and other Whites tend to remove their children from it and minority segregation inevitably follows.

This pattern of White exodus from the public schools has proceeded in Washington, D.C., Newark, New Jersey, and perhaps elsewhere, to the point of near-total segregation. In less than 10 years, for example, the Washington public school pupil population changed from about 1/3 to more than 3/4 Negro. They may well be 9/10 Negro by 1970.

The trend toward school segregation has been and will continue to be slower in New York City. There are several reasons for this prediction. New York City is much larger than Washington and Newark, and its adults are employed in much more widely diversified occupations. For these and other economic and structural reasons, New York City can absorb a numerically greater amount of ethnic change than other cities without the change being reflected as dramatically or extremely in overall statistics. New York City can also "hold" a greater proportion of its White families for a longer period than can other cities.

Another important consideration is the balance between private and public schools. About 70% of the city's White students were in public schools in 1960, compared with 86% of its Negro students. Stated another way, there are about 1.4 million White and Negro students enrolled in schools in New York City. Of these, about 400 thousand are in private and parochial schools; and of these, only 32 thousand (less than 10%) are Negroes.

Most of the 32 thousand are in schools operated under the auspices of Roman Catholic and Episcopal Churches, which together account for nearly 3/4 of the city's private school students.

> The cultural and ethnic diversity of New York City which has long been one of its principal assets now offers a priceless opportunity if we can but muster the ingenuity to turn it to the advantage of the schools and the children.
>
> —The Advisory Committee

Our data lead us to predict that, in the absence of significant efforts by the board of education and other groups and agencies, the New York City public schools by 1980 will enroll about 70% to 75% Negro and Puerto Rican pupils and that the proportion may be expected to stabilize at that level.

Even though no action by the board of education can prevent the growth of minority population, wise and intelligent policies can contribute substantially to preventing extreme school segregation. What occurs when firm preventive steps are not taken is all too obvious: when a city school system moves from ethnic balance to extreme segregation, the quality of its instructional services is undermined as support, both lay and professional, declines. Aggressive policies designed to desegregate the schools and improve instruction simultaneously can,

Aug - Sep. 64

in contrast, make such a period of ethnic change one of *heightened* confidence in public education.

The options available to New York City are not unlimited but they are real. Total desegregation of all schools, for example, is simply not attainable in the foreseeable future and neither planning nor pressure can change that fact. Yet if nothing more is done, or too little is attempted, the outcome will inevitably be more extensive and more extreme segregation and a larger number of poor schools. More can be done, however, and should be. With thoughtful planning, bold policies and vigorous action, there are sound reasons to believe that the spread of segregation can be slowed, its severity reduced, and the effectiveness of school programs substantially improved.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

By the definition used in this report, the proportion of segregated schools in the public school system may be expected to increase between 1963 and 1975 from 22% to 38% at the elementary level, from 19% to 29% at the junior high school level, and from 2% to 6% at the high school level, *unless* steps far more comprehensive and effective than those currently proposed by the board of education are taken promptly.

Some remedies that have been suggested are both impractical and educationally undesirable. Among these is long-distance transportation of elementary school pupils. This device appears to promise the greatest immediate change in *de facto* segregation, but in many cases it is more likely to have a negative effect. Residential segregation in Brooklyn for example, is so extreme that some 70,000 Negro and Puerto Rican children, aged 5 through 11, would have to be transported twice daily on trips as long as that from Brighton Beach to Fulton Street, some 10 miles or 50 city bus minutes away. In Manhattan, because of an even higher proportion of Negro and Puerto Rican children, even greater amounts of transport would not effect integration. The same condition holds (but in a lesser degree) for the Bronx and Queens.

Persuaded by the fact, however, that *there are steps which could be taken by the board to desegregate the public schools,* we sought ways to reduce segregation and at the same time improve education. As our earlier interpretation of the city ethnic trends reveals, we believe that part of the educational desirability of any plan at this time must be its *mutual* acceptance by both minority groups and Whites. It should be obvious, but does not always appear to be, that integration is impossible without White pupils. No plan can be acceptable, therefore, which increases the movement of White pupils out of the public schools. Neither is it acceptable, however, unless it contributes to desegregation. Our criteria for devising proposals are therefore these: (1) genuine, prompt reduction of school segregation; (2) improvement in the quality of educational services; and (3) retention and, if possible, attraction of more White pupils.

It is our considered judgment that a major reorganization of the school system is required in order to achieve within a period of the next ten to fifteen years the twin goals of high quality schools and the greatest possible degree of desgregation.

Th data on the ethnic composition of schools indicates most clearly that even a comprehensive desegregation plan will not eliminate all segregated schools. Our proposals will, however, reduce the number of them and retard the spread of segregation. They will also increase the proportion of Negro, Puerto Rican and White children who will have the opportunity for integrated experience in good schools.

HIGH SCHOOLS

The maximum degree of desegregation can now be achieved at the high school level. This possibility can be realized by the more effective use of existing plants and the strategic selection of sites for new buildings. Toward this end, the board of education should introduce a large scale

Aug - Sep. 64

program of construction and development of *four year comprehensive high schools.*

We recommend that these high schools include grades nine through twelve, absorbing ninth grades now assigned to junior high schools. We recommend further that to accommodate the ninth grade students, and to relieve overcrowding from the already anticipated increases in grades ten, eleven, and twelve, the high school construction program be revised.

Most of the new four year comprehensive high schools should be located at sites in the north Bronx and in predominantly White neighborhoods in Brooklyn and Queens. These are the three boroughs that are now moving most rapidly toward predominantly Negro and Puerto Rican public school populations. Within ten years, therefore, comprehensive high schools located in now white neighborhoods will, in all likelihood, be centers of desegregated communities outside the ghetto. *The first step to be taken would be to revise the planned locations of the five high schools projected by the board of education for construction in 1964 and 1965. At least four of these are now projected for location in heavily segregated residential areas.*

Comprehensive schools on well selected sites would provide a significant counterforce to the present slow but evident trend toward segregated high schools. They will do this by redistributing students now segregated by reason either of their residence or of the curricula they are presently pursuing. At present 78% of the pupils in academic high schools are Whites, while only 52% of the pupils in vocational high schools are Whites. The programs of the new high schools should be planned to assure a suitably high level of general education for all students. Such vocational courses as are to be continued should be distributed among the comprehensive schools rather than concentrated in wholly specialized vocational units. While some special-purpose schools may well be justified, the policy should be to eliminate those in which attendance seems to imply a stigma, or which show a trend toward increasing racial homogeneity.

We recommend further that all high schools should be open to all students on a city-wide basis with no restrictions except those needed to prevent the over-crowding of particular schools.

In short, this proposal would seek to promote the desegregation of the high schools and to meet the educational needs of all groups by introducing schools that are neither too general nor too specialized to adapt to changing occupational and cultural conditions. An additional advantage of including the ninth grade in the high schools is that this grade contains a larger proportion of minority students than the tenth through twelfth grades. The four year organization will accordingly yield a better ethnic balance and will increase the number of students who will have the opportunity for integrated educational experience.

THE MIDDLE SCHOOL

In order to extend the process of desegregation to the lower grades and at the same time improve the educational opportunities for children we recommend the establishment of new *middle schools* to include grades 7 and 8 of the present junior high schools and grades 5 and 6 of the present elementary schools. At present there are 25 Negro-Puerto Rican Type segregated junior high schools; there are 29 White Type segregated junior high schools. The junior high schools represent a concentration and intensification of the effects of segregation.

For the immediate future most middle schools should be located in former junior high schools renovated for their new purpose. Their ethnic mixtures, especially in the ghetto fringe areas, can approach desegregation because students would be drawn from predominantly White as well as predominantly Negro and Puerto Rican elementary schools, and because increased equity of distribution will make this possible.

Aug - Sep. 64

> To argue that no classroom can be good without a white child in it is inaccurate and cruel. But, it cannot be denied that a child who has learned from experience to understand and appreciate people of races other than his own has a sounder basis for both his education and his life.
>
> —The Advisory Committee

All of the segregated junior high schools should be eliminated immediately. Of the 25 in this group, more than half are situated in the deep centers of the several residential ghettoes. Elimination of junior high schools should begin at the fringes of the ghettoes, going in as deeply as transportation and the effective organization of the complexes described later will allow. Over the period from 1965 through 1970, the abolition of junior high schools could make a substantial contribution, particularly to preventing future growth in the number of upper level ghetto schools. Even while some segregation will remain in the middle schools, it might be possible to so organize the cluster of primary schools which feed each middle school in order to increase the racial heterogeneity of most of these middle schools.

(See discussion of *Education Complex* below.)

The program of the middle school should be planned to meet the educational needs of older children through increasingly diversified and specialized instruction. The upper grades of the middle school would be expected to resemble the better parts of the junior high school. Giving the seventh and eighth grades the status of being the senior members of their school communities may be expected to reduce some of the adjustment problems that have so long plagued the junior high school. Middle school students would also begin their exposure to secondary education earlier, yet not be subjected to the undesirable poor models provided by so many ninth graders in the current junior high schol system, models of antagonism and indifference toward school induced by the onset of adolescence combined with a lack of preparation for or hope about movement into senior high school. Middle schools and four year comprehensive high schools may in combination contribute to reducing the citywide problem of dropouts from high school. The middle school provide strong programs of guidance and such other special services as may be needed and should give close attention to both the special aptitudes and the handicaps of its pupils. As has been pointed out, junior high school buildings may be converted for the use of these units. In the newer plants, relatively few physical changes should be necessary.

The middle school as envisioned in this proposal would receive its students from a combined and clustered set of between two and six primary schools, as described below.

PRIMARY SCHOOLS

We recommend that a new school unit be established to include the first four grades, the kindergarten, and as soon as they can be added, one or two years of pre-kindergarten education. The pre-kindergarten programs should be added first in those neighborhoods where the need is greatest. The primary unit should be centered in the neighborhood and a close as possible to the homes of the children attending it.

Wherever possible, a unit should not enroll more than 500 pupils although where larger buildings are used, as will be necessary in many cases, two or more such units might well be organized in the same building. The reason for proposing relatively small groups is to make it possible for the young child to feel himself a member of his school group, to make it possible for the faculty of the unit to work together as a close knit organization and to enable the parents of the school to work closely with it on a continuous and intensive basis.

The primary unit should be organized on a non-graded basis so as to facilitate the continuous progress of pupils as individuals without arbitrary barriers of grade placement, and time

Aug - Sep. 64

limits. Such an arrangement should also add to the possibility of introducing forms of coordinated or team teaching, variable grouping of pupils and the imaginative use of space, materials, and teaching devices.

The program of the school should be planned to serve both the general educational needs of young children and any special requirements of children in its own neighborhood. The parents should be involved in many ways, including service as volunteers, or where feasible, as part-time or full-time paid assistants. Close liaison should be maintained with the homes through the services of counselors, school social workers, and classroom teachers when they are adequately prepared for this additional duty. Parent education programs should also be developed as a part of the program of the local school, with appropriate staff assistance by specialists.

These neighborhood units will inevitably in many cases be segregated. We recognize the disadvantage of that condition but believe that it is offset by the superior opportunities for teaching and guidance that such a school offers. Since in many neighborhoods integration can be achieved only at the expense of large amounts of travel time and the transfer of a child to a school far from his own home, we believe that on balance the neighborhood primary unit is the more desirable arrangement.

THE EDUCATIONAL COMPLEX

Neighborhood primary schools and nearby middle schools should be combined into clusters that, for want of a more descriptive term, we shall call *educational complexes*. An educational complex will be composed of from two to five primary schools and one or two middle schools. The new organizations should be created first wherever they will contribute to desegregation or better integration. [In Appendix II—not reproduced here—are listed several possibilities. These are sections of the city where existing neighborhood schools (to become primary schools) are close enough to one another to cooperate closely, or are so situated that the middle schools might be desegreated.]

An educational complex should be administered by a *senior administrator*, who should be given authority and autonomy to develop a program which meets appropriate city-wide standards but is also directly relevant to the needs of the locality. Primary schools within the complex should share among themselves facilities, and special staff, and should be coordinated to encourage frequent association among students and parents from the several units. Within the education complex teachers will be better able to help children from diverse ethnic backgrounds to become acquainted with one another. Parent-teacher and parent-school relations should be built on the bases of both the individual school and the complex. The children—and their parents—will thus gain the dual benefits of a school close to home and of membership in a larger, more diverse educational and social community. The concept of the educational complex arises in part from the view that the means of education and much of their control should be centered locally.

Although it may not be possible to desegregate all primary schools, ultimately most of them should be integrated educationally. This will aid the better preparation of students for life and study in the middle school; it will more nearly equalize resources; and it will give the staff in the primary schools new opportunities for innovation and originality in their work.

It may be useful to illustrate the arrangement and operation of schools under our proposals. In District 8 in Manhattan, P.S. 75, P.S. 84, and P.S. 166 are currently desegregated elementary schools in transition toward partial White-Type segregated. They are located near one another and near Junior High School 118. These units would become an educational complex under our recommendations, the ninth graders from 118 being reassigned to the reorganized comprehensive high schools situated outside a ghetto area. Fifth and sixth graders from 75, 84 and 166 would be picked

Aug - Sep. 64

up at designated assembly points and *transported by shuttle bus* to middle school 118, a trip requiring not more than 10 to 15 minutes, or *the average time it now takes children to walk to school.* This policy will prevail in as many instances as possible.

Another illustration: P.S. 189, 219, 156, 175, and 183, in Districts 41 and 42 of Brooklyn are located near one another, and near junior high 252. The entire group is proceeding toward Negro-Puerto Rican Type school segregation, for these schools are on the fringe of the rapidly enlarging Bedford-Stuyvesant community. If no changes are introduced, it is predictable that junior high school 252 will have less than 10% White students by 1970, rather than the present 40% White. The board of education proposed for this area a Princeton-type pairing of P.S. 156 with P.S. 210. This would desegregate *one* elementary school but would leave the other schools in the immediate area vulnerable to rapid and extreme segregation. Our plan, in contrast, would mean that the youngest primary children would go to their nearby elementary schools. Thus, P.S. 210 would remain predominantly White and P.S. 156 predominantly Negro and Puerto Rican. Both sets of parents would, however, be encouraged to *stay on* in the community because a good, stable, and desegregated middle school was at hand.

We recommend further that, as soon as possible, the middle schools should be located in educational parks so situated as to provide children in as many parts of the city as is feasible, the experience of attending a genuinely integrated school during their middle school years. We recognize that for reasons previously pointed out, it may not be possible for some time to assure every child such an experience, but our objective is to bring it about for the greatest possible number. This we think can be accomplished by locating groups of middle schools on large sites designed to accommodate p e r h a p s 15,000 children with administrative units organized so that each child will be a member of a school enrolling 500 to 1,000 pupils. The most practical location for such schools would be in areas where a suitable number of minority group children can be drawn from existing ghetto neighborhoods into parks which will also enroll children from White neighborhoods.

EQUALIZING FACILITIES

Good physical facilities are no substitute for good teaching but they are powerful auxiliaries to it. Obviously, there are limits on the speed with which New York City can reconstruct its gigantic collection of more than a thousand buildings. Many of them are deteriorating and it is essential that more be done to improve the buildings and equipment of the school system, especially in the depressed and segregated neighborhoods. This condition requires immediate and sustained attention.

> In all planning about altering the educational system — from elementary school up — so that there will be real opportunity for equality, the major emphasis must be on reaching the mass of low-income youngsters. A danger in Higher Horizons, in college scholarships for high-ranking Negroes, and in similar approaches is that, as they succeed, the white community, its conscience soothed, does not recognize that surface amelioration is not enough.
>
> —Nat Hentoff, *The New Equality*

As of 1963, in spite of the fact that the board erected many new schools in the last 5 years (26 as replacements for schools within ghettoes), Negro and Puerto Rican segregated schools as a group were still, on the average, the oldest in the city; formed the greatest number of overcrowded buildings, and included the greatest number of buildings in need of modernization or installation of essential facilities.

STAFFING THE CLASSROOM

Desegregation and the prevention of further school segregation alike hinge upon the creation of public schools so excellent that parents of all ethnic

groups will enroll their children with confidence and pride. This condition hinges in turn upon the recruitment, certification, supervision, and retention of outstanding classroom teachers.

Without good teaching desegregation is educationally meaningless. Moreover it becomes increasingly impossible to achieve as parents lose confidence in their public schools and as those with higher economic, occupational, and educational attainment can achieve the means to move away. Authentic desegregation is impossible without the progressive provision of improved instruction in the public schools. The proposals for modifying the organization of levels in the schools and for the clustering of units form a basis for such improvement. A major reconstruction of the sort outlined will introduce *new incentives* for such teachers. The new *Educational Complexes* can become centers within which exciting professional activity and development is both possible and encouraged. We would go further, however. Many practices of the present city system must be changed drastically if more good teachers are to be employed, attracted to assignments in heavily mixed schools, and retained while they mature toward professional excellence.

For example, more Negro and Puerto Rican teachers and administrators must be recruited and advanced in responsibility as rapidly as their performance justifies. Although the school system does not close any of its positions to members of minority groups, Negroes have had more difficulty than others progressing through the system's hierarchy.

It should be possible to find more than the present group of fewer than 10 Negroes who are competent to handle some of the system's more than 1,200 administrative positions. Surely more than the present 2 or 3 Negroes are capable of outstanding service among the 800 principalships.

It is not enough that selection standards be high and objective. An equally important question is whether they are sufficiently relevant and flexible to obtain people with the qualities most needed in the schools.

We propose, therefore, greater flexibility in the recruitment and examination of school staff members. The Board of Examiners since 1960 has placed somewhat less emphasis on written test performance. This reform should be continued and intensified.

We also propose greater flexibility in the design of the teacher's day. The reports persist that teachers and other staff members are overburdened by paperwork, lack of clerical and technical support, and are subjected to unprofessional regulations that unduly restrict their performance.

The proposed reorganization should be used as an opportunity to correct these conditions. With the development of *Educational Complexes,* middle schools and comprehensive high schools, considerable decentralization will be possible. Within system-wide policies to assure high minimum standards of administration, teaching, pupil services and community relations, decentralization can release administrators and teachers from standardized requirements. The local initiative and responsible freedom essential to good schools must be more actively encouraged.

At present, a spurious "reward structure" exists within the staffing pattern of the New York schools. Through it, less experienced and less competent teachers are assigned to the least "desirable" yet professionally most demanding depressed area schools. As the teacher gains experience and demonstrates competence, his mobility upward usually means mobility away from the pupils with the greatest need for skilled help. The classrooms that most urgently need the best teachers are thus most often deprived of them.

With the assignment of a teacher to one of the proposed *Complexes* such transfers would be unnecessary. Within a *Complex* teachers will be able to work with a variety of types of pupils or colleagues. No *Complex* need be a "hardship post" or "ghetto outpost." They can become centers of professional excitement and growth.

Aug - Sep. 64

This prospect will not be realized, however, merely by changing the organization of schools within the *Complexes*. Serious and sustained efforts will have to be made to achieve equitable assignment of staff, competent supervision, strong support structure, a release from constrictions on local and individual initiative, and maximum racial heterogeneity.

TRAINING TEACHERS

While the board becomes more flexible and imaginative in its personnel recruitment efforts, as we believe it has since 1961, it must also look more closely at its *training* resources.

For example, arrangements must be made so that student teachers may take their practice in schools that are well mixed ethnically, and even predominantly Negro and Puerto Rican. To accomplish this, the college auspices under which the professional education occurs must be strengthened substantially. Virtually every one of the city's public and private higher educational institutions has experimented with programs for teachers planning to enter big city schools Most of these efforts remain underfinanced; only a few are more than tentative pilot projects; and too few provide any solid basis for close cooperation with the public school system.

In order for these new programs in teacher preparation to succeed, more than a few courses in urban sociology are needed. State and federal as well as city funds must be channeled into cooperative reasearch and development activities to involve colleges and universities more effectively on the work of the urban school system. The major training institutions should not be devoted as consistently as they have been to the preparation of teachers for suburbia.

PRE-PRIMARY PROGRAMS

Harvard psychologist Thomas Pettigrew has commented, "Fourteen generations of Negro talent have already been wasted by American society; our technological society cannot afford to waste yet another." If the talents of the young are to be cultivated and preserved, the process must, under modern conditions, not only take longer; it must also start sooner. The outstanding educational program necessary to prevent further segregation of schools and children in New York, moreover, depends upon high levels of aspiration and school-type achievement among a larger proportion of children. The talents of New York City children must, therefore, be cultivated earlier than ever before. Only a new, *citywide* program of pre-kindergarten education will stimulate this change.

There are two reasons why we urge that the board of education introduce on a large-scale basis a pre-primary program of instruction. First, it is at this level that what we have elsewhere called *compensatory* education can have a significant impact. The materially or socially deprived child can gain most from extra enrichment at the age of 3 and 4. This program is both compensatory and preventative. It would cost less and have greater benefits than remedial programs for adolescent dropouts.

We recommend that the pilot projects in pre-primary instruction be adopted progressively throughout the city, beginning first within the *Educational Complexes* and in the centers of ghetto areas. The board of education should be encouraged to cooperate closely in this activity with the City

> Prejudice declines and new racial roles develop in desegregated situations where the two groups: (1) possess approximately equal status, (2) seek common goals, (3) are cooperatively dependent upon one another, and (4) interact with the positive support of authorities, law, or custom. Wherever these conditions are attained, in schools, at work, in neighborhoods, or in the armed forces, reworkable alterations occur in the attitudes and behavior of both Negroes and Whites.
>
> —Thomas F. Pettigrew, *A Profile of the Negro American*

aug-Sep. 64

Department of Welfare's Division of Infant Day Care Centers, which can provide additional starting points for this program.

SPECIAL SCHOOLS

Few objective data are available on the programs of the special schools but, what evidence we do have suggests that these schools, particularly the 600 schools, have grown at a rapid pace in recent years. The functions they are designed to serve remain vague. We could find, for example, no clear statement of the present curriculum for these schools. And the available data indicate a disproportionate number of minority group students in these schools. The plans for the newer programs for special students seem, in Junior Guidance classes and After-School programs, similarly unclear.

Special schools seem often to be set up deliberately outside the neighborhood where their students live. The rationale offered is to release the child from his antagonistic surroundings without embarrassing him by special placement in his own neighborhood schools. Actually, this arrangement also removes the child from his family, neighborhood, peers, and normal school experience. Although he is officially defined as a special problem, he is also treated as if he were autonomous and responsible enough to *commute* to a distant school. The arrangement, to say the least, raises serious questions.

Similar questions must be raised about educational provisions for the mentally retarded. Gerhart Saenger in his report, *Factors Influencing the Institutionalization of Mentally Retarded Individuals in New York City*, said in 1960, that "more than half of the recently institutionalized low grade retarded children came from Puerto Rican and Negro families, even though these groups together make up slightly less than one-quarter of the population of the city." Saenger also identifies probable serious errors in the diagnostic and referral systems leading up to institutionalization.

The total numbers of disturbed, maladjusted, and retarded students in the city's public schools are very small compared with the total student population, yet we believe that the *educational quality* of a school system can be assessed to an important degree by the treatment it affords the most disadvantaged, the needy, and deviant groups of children and youth. We do not have adequate facts about special educational programs in the city. It appears that such information has not been secured by the school system itself.

We therefore propose that objective, independent studies be made of the care and schooling of special students in the city's public school system, and the results published. We also propose that *special educational programs be closely related to the neighborhood primary school and the middle school.* Children with emotional and social handicaps should increasingly be dealt with as those with physical handicaps are. If a student is not principally an invalid, a *medical* patient, or a hazard to his school mates, he should be educated with his peers or at least within the same school building. If the child's primary problem is medical or one requiring custody, the responsibility for him should rest with an agency other than the school.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

These proposals are advanced as a *minimum* program of changes that are necessary if the board is to reduce and prevent school segregation. The proposals may be modified in their particulars, but their combined magnitude and import is, if anything, an understatement of what must be done to achieve desegregation in New York City schools.

Can the New York City public school system, already burdened with excessive fiscal problems, achieve these goals? One response is the logic of crisis: As Commissioner Allen wrote about New York's school system in 1962, "In many ways, possibly in most ways, the future of the metropolis is being written in its classrooms today. Unless what is being done now is done better, and unless much, much

Aug - Sep. 64

more is done that is now being done, that future will be a bleak one in many respects."

The second answer is that more is at stake in New York City than the future well being of a single city. The public school students of this community form more than 1/3 of the total public school enrollment of New York State. A large part of the State's responsibility for the welfare of its youth is concentrated here.

The third consideration is that among all the great cities of the North, New York's public schools stand a better social chance of achieving authentic desegregation than possibly any of the others. This city is comparatively free of the forces of social and political reaction against full civil rights. This city has a heritage of cultural innovation and educational progress. If school segregation cannot be fought effectively here, if the public school children of New York City must be relegated to second class status for lack of energy and effort, the nation will have reason to despair.

In view of the enormity of both the problem and the possibilities, we *propose that both the State and Federal governments be urged to demonstrate their deep involvement through progressive increases in fiscal support. When municipal initiatives toward substantial change are demonstrated, and as they are introduced, substantial financial assistance and technical cooperation will be essential.* It is doubtful that without large scale additional State and Federal support, the necessary reforms can even be successfully begun, much less thoroughly completed.

THE TEST OF SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

An effective program of desegregation will be very costly. It will require funds not available from within the public economy of New York City, to be sure. Yet, there are steps that can be taken by the board of education and by the superintendent of schools and by others that will not require extra funds. *Decisions and actions on these, we suggest, should become the test of whether the city's educational policy makers seriously intend to reduce and to prevent further segregation.*

The fact that outside support must be obtained to accelerate desegregation should not become a reason for inaction. Indeed, it is probable that when the board of education initiates its own revised program, significant outside help will materialize. The steps that can be taken now and over the coming year without additional outside funds, include the following.

1. The 5 high schools already projected by the board for construction and already capitalized could be relocated outside minority ghettoes and redesigned to become comprehensive high schools. This would set the precedent for future secondary school construction.

2. Junior high schools feeding the new comprehensive high schools, other new junior high schools for construction, and selected junior highs from the list of *Educational Complexes* contained in the appendix to this report, should be chosen for conversion into middle schools. This conversion could be accomplished, we believe, without great extra expense within the next year. Later, additional conversions would require further funds.

3. A first series of *Educational Complexes* could be created around the newly formed middle schools cited above. These would require complicated administrative and faculty reorganization but no important addition to expenditures.

4. Openings for Negro and Puerto Rican teachers and administrators can be widened immediately without extra expense.

5. Greater flexibility and autonomy can be provided to the principals and their staffs within the new *Educational Complexes.*

6. Newly strengthened cooperation between teacher training institutions and the Board can be developed over the next year with no important additional expenditures of funds.

7. Studies and policy reviews of the

organization of special educational services, especially for the socially maladjusted and the mentally retarded, can be initiated at no important additional cost.

Prompt decisions and vigorous action on these items will demonstrate the clarity of purpose, the firmness of commitment, and the determination to succeed that the entire community is waiting to witness and eager to applaud.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF REPORT

A. *Findings:*

1. Puerto Rican, Negro and other students in public schools in New York City suffer extensive and serious ethnic segregation.

2. This segregation increased between 1958 and 1963, and will continue to increase over the next 10 to 15 years, unless deliberate policies are introduced to reduce current levels and prevent future increases in segregation.

3. The board of education has made efforts between 1954 and the present which were intended to reduce segregation. These efforts have had *no* measurable effect upon the overall number of students attending segregated schools or upon the number of segregated schools in the system.

4. Early in 1964, the board of education introduced new proposals intended to aid in desegregating the public schools. The new proposals, considered singly and in combination, would *not* reduce current levels of school segregation or prevent future increases.

5. Ethnic segregation cannot be wholly eliminated from the schools of New York City in the foreseeable future, but the adoption of wise and intelligent policies can reduce segregation substantially. The basic requirement is a deep and sustained commitment on the part of the board and its staff to the purpose of reducing segregation throughout the city at the earliest time and at the fastest possible rate.

6. The adopted building program of the board does *not* treat *desegregation* as a main factor in choosing sites, although this factor could be utilized.

7. Wise and intelligent policies to foster desegregation must include intensified efforts to raise the quality of school program and teaching in New York City schools to the highest level, which is to say a degree of excellence second to none in the United States. The purpose of desegregation and increased excellence must be pursued simultaneously. They are absolutely interdependent.

8. The real accomplishment of both objectives is a complicated, costly, and difficult undertaking. It is far beyond what many advocates of change have seemed willing to recognize or acknowledge. Basic changes in the present organization of the school

A NATURAL ALLIANCE

Essential to our success in the years ahead is a working partnership between education and the civil rights movement. In carrying forward our present momentum for change, we can expect that there will be strains and stresses and initial misunderstandings. But these creative tensions are always vital to the process of progress.

Educators and the public at large will be wrong if they view school boycotts and parents' marches as indications of a fundamental division between the schools and the civil rights movement. And civil rights leaders will also be wrong if they forget the positive purpose of such protests, if they allow these creative tensions to degenerate into destructive hostility.

There is a natural alliance among us. We must preserve it and foster it. Then, together, we shall shape new dimensions of democracy for all our children and for our children's children.

—Francis Keppel, May 28, 1964

Aug - Sep. 64

grades and the revision of construction programs are essential to desegregation and improvement, as are new concepts of recruitment, faculty involvement, curriculum design, pupil services, administrative operation, plant use, and inter-school communication.

B. *Recommendations:*

1. Comprehensive four year high schools should be built at points well outside existing ethnic ghettoes, to be attended by commuting youths from points all over the city as well as by local residents.

2. Fifth through eighth grade middle schools should replace junior high schools ultimately in the entire system. The purpose of these units should be to furnish improved instruction for older children. They should be so located as to provide for as many children as possible an experience in an integrated school. Shuttle buses should be used to reach these middle schools.

3. Primary units extending from prekindergarten classes through the fourth grade should replace existing elementary schools. These units would still be neighborhood schools, but they would be organized differently and would feed into the middle schools. Many existing elementary schools could be reorganized to contain two or more primary units.

4. *Educational complexes* should be formed, consisting of from two to six primary units clustered around the middle schools. These should be managed by a single administrator, with assistant administrators in the separate unit buildings. The *complexes* should integrate educational activities, improve the distribution of facilities and resources, and promote communication between faculties, parents, and students from diverse ethnic backgrounds. *Complexes* should have a high degree of organizational autonomy over their programs.

5. Eventually, educational parks housed newly developed structures on cleared sites should replace single middle schools with their *educational complexes.*

6. Facilities should be equalized in every way, so that mainly Puerto Rican and Negro schools in the city will *not* continue to be older, more overcrowded, and in greater need of installation of essential facilities than other schools.

7. The new organization of the system should be utilized to stabilize and improve the staffing of the schools. The middle schools and clustered primary units with their new autonomy should be used to attract and retain the best teachers and administrators.

8. Board programs to improve recruitment and advancement of minority group teachers and other personnel should be extended and intensified. As part of this, training relations between the system and local teacher training institutions must be greatly strengthened.

9. Pre-primary programs of instruction should be introduced on a citywide basis, serving children as young as three years.

10. Special schools and programs, particularly those for maladjusted and retarded students, should be studied independently and the findings should be made public. A stronger policy for retaining more such students in their regular schools should be pursued.

11. State and Federal support, fiscal and administrative, should be provided to the city to accomplish these necessary changes. This support should begin after the board of education has demonstrated its new initiative and commitment by taking some of the steps toward desegregation which do not involve additional municipal expenditures.

Our proposals do, we trust, make plain the fact that substantial forces must be reckoned with and redirected if desegregation is to be achieved. If these proposals are adopted and implemented we are confident they will effect some immediate desegregation. More importantly, they would help prevent an increase in the rate of segregation within the schools. To accomplish this, however, they would

aug - Sep. 64

have to be introduced promptly, progressively, and in an ever more extensive network during the next five years.

NEGOTIATIONS IN NEW YORK CITY

Representatives of major civil rights groups — NAACP, CORE, Harlem Parents Committee, City-Wide Committee for Integrated Schools, the Urban League, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, EQUAL, representing white parents for integration, and the Conference for Integrated, Quality Education, an organization of labor, religious, and civic groups essentially from the white community — have engaged in a series of conferences for the past two weeks with the superintendent of schools and his staff.

As the result of these discussions, certain agreements which we will recommend to our memberships were reached on (1) September, 1964 desegregation steps and (2) subsequent desgregation plans.

While the September, 1964 steps are very limited, our discussions resulted in eliminating a number of objectionable features, the central one being the assignment of thousands of Negro and Puerto Rican children from segregated elementary to segregated junior high schools. Instead, they will have the alternative of assignment with free transportation to integrated or white elementary schools and will continue with their classmates to the junior and senior high schools in those areas.

It was agreed that the September, 1964 steps would be followed by plans for substantial desegregation, to be formulated by the superintendent of schools in working consultation with Dr. Robert Dentler of the Institute of Urban Studies, Columbia University, and civil rights and community groups. It was further agreed that these plans would be in accord with the recommendations of the Allen Report. The major additional plans, effective no later than September, 1965, include:

1. Development of the first series of integrated middle schools with their educational complexes;
2. As part of the organization of the first series of middle schools, steps toward the elimination of segregated junior high schools.
3. Opening additional high schools for junior high schools involved in the board's integration plans, and city-wide plans for high school desegregation.

The discussions that have been held were in a spirit of cooperation and an understanding of the aims and goals of integrated, quality education. It is on this basis, together with the refinements and agreements concerning future plans, that we will make our recommendations to our respective organizations.

—Joint release, June 15, 1964.

ON RESPECT

Respect for the culturally different does not rest upon sympathy nor condescension. It is not synonymous with love in the sense of sentimental fondness. Respect is related to empathy, the ability and willingness to project oneself into a child's circumstances and role. Empathy facilitates communication between the students and the school and begins to open doors to locked-out youth. A teacher who wants to give love and who demands it in return is on the wrong track and has compromised the respect she owes her children.

—Eugene McCreary